applicable only to such of the municipalities as had entertained the doubt.

Mr. SYED MOHIYDUDIN HUSSAIN observed that in many municipal councils there were two parties, and that if one party favoured the appointment of a Chief Officer the other would be quite against it, so that it might not be possible for a council to appoint a Chief Officer at all. At the same time, a Chief Officer for every council was necessary and there must be some authority competent to make the appointment. That was why the Government had proposed to take power for making the appointments in all cases. But simply because a Chief Officer was appointed, it should not be understood that the municipal council would thereby lose all its power. The power of the council in all other respects would remain unaffected. So long as the Chief Officer discharged his duties properly and satisfactorily, the council would keep him on. And in case he was not found to be efficient or satisfactory, the municipal council would have every power to remove him. Thus, there would be no harm in Chief Officers being appointed by Government, or in the power of making such appointments being vested in Government.

Mr. KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHEB, in welcoming the measure, said that vesting in Government the power to appoint Chief Officers would be in the best interests of the municipalities. The Government were in a better position than the municipalities to select competent persons for appointments as Chief Officers. And being appointed by the Government, these officers could enjoy security of tenure which would certainly keep the officers contented, earnest and efficient, and the municipal councils would get all the benefit of having such officers. The foremost advantage of having efficient executive officers would be that all the revenue due to the municipal councils would be collected promptly and the councils would thus have the wherewithal for carrying out their several schemes of improvement. After all, the question as to who should make the appointments was of little importance. In British India also, the Provincial Governments made the appointments of Commissioners to municipal councils. On that same analogy, there was no reason why the local bodies in Mysore should object to Chief Officers being appointed by the Government themselves, specially in view of the assurance of the Government that municipal councils would continue to have the power of passing a vote of censure against any Chief Officer who was guilty of dereliction of duty.

At 4-30 p.m., the House adjourned to meet again at 12 of the clock the following day.

Elections from the Representative Assembly to the Senate of the University of Mysore and to the panels of the three Standing Committees for (i) *Railways, Public Works and Electrical Departments,* (ii) *Local Self-Government and the Departments of Medicine, Sanitation and Public Health, and* (iii) *Finance and Taxation, were then held.*

SECOND DAY.

Tuesday, 15th June 1937.

The House reassembled at the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Tuesday, 15th June 1937, at 12 of the clock, Mr. President (*Amin-ul-Mulk* Sir Mirza M. Ismail, K.C.I.E., O.B.E., Dewan) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Frontier Toll-gates.

Q.—10. **Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU** (Yelandur Jahgir); **N. BHOGI MALLAIYA** (Heggaddevankote Taluk); **S. K. SIDDE GOWDA** and **S. THIMME GOWDA** *alias* **THAMMAIYA GOWDA** (Krishnarajpet Taluk); **B. SIDDALINGA SETTY** (Krishnarajanagar Taluk); **K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA** and **GURUBASAPPA** (Chamarajanagar Taluk); **M. MAYI GOWDA** (T.-Narsipur Taluk); **U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO** (Mysore City Municipality); **G. MALLANNA** (Mysore Taluk); **K. C. SUBBANNA** (Gundlupet Taluk); **S. C. MALLIAH** (Maddur Taluk); **M. SUBBIAH** (Seringapatam Municipality); **B. CHAMAIYA** and

M. SIVANANJE GOWDA (Seringapatam Taluk); **K. CHIKKALINGIAH** and **J. DEVAIYA** (Mandya Taluk); and **T. MARIYAPPA** (Nagamangala Taluk).

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) what was the annual income from each of the Frontier Toll-gates of the Mysore District from 1st July 1930 up to the date of taking over of their management by Government (to be given for each toll-gate separately);

(*b*) what is the income received from each Frontier Toll-gate per year after Government undertook to collect the tolls;

(*c*) what is the annual amount spent on the establishment at each Frontier Toll-gate?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar).**—

(*a*)—

	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	1934-35	1935-36
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
Koppa-Muthur *	9,000	7,620	8,040	10,130	8,653	4,140
Sivasamudram Bridge	3,050	2,880	5,880	7,920	5,652	4,635
Karepalya Toll-gate	5,560	4,920	4,980	7,200	6,504	6,120
Kekkanahalla, Moolehole ...	11,728	14,511	14,511	12,200	16,492	7,328
Panchavalli (Anechowkur) ...	3,750	3,540	3,900	5 602	4,007	1,498

* Koppa-Muthur; then called by one name as Peripatna Toll-gate.

(*b*)—

	During the year 1936 (Calendar year)	From 1st January 1937 to 10th May 1937	Total
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1. Koppa	2,752	1,118	3,870
2. Muthur	3,101	1,517	4,618
3. Anechowkur	2,105	1,124	3,229
4. Sivasamudram Bridge ...	From 1st July 1936 to 1st May 1937	...	5,062
5. Karepalya	Do	...	4,887
6. Kekkanahalla	From 1st January 1936 to 31st December 1936	...	13,219
7. Moolehole	Do	...	6,737
8. Viranahosahalli*	From 14th September 1936 to 31st March 1937	...	6,156

* This toll-gate was converted into an interior toll-gate from 1st April 1937.

(*c*)—

	During 1936	From 1st January 1937 up to 30th April 1937	Total
	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
1. Koppa	1,060	333	1,393
2. Muthur	1,060	333	1,393
3. Anechowkur...	1,060	333	1,393
4. Sivasamudram	1st July 1936 to 1st May 1937	...	1,238
5. Karepalya	Do	...	752
6. Kekkanahalla	1st January 1936 to 31st December 1936	...	795
7. Moolehole	Do	...	622
8. Viranahosahalli	14th September 1936 to 31st March 1937	...	517

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—From the figures furnished in answer to the question, is it not evident that the income from the toll-gates is going down from year to year ever since the Government took over their management?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—The new system cannot be judged by merely the receipts under tolls. The figures furnished in the answer do not represent receipts for exactly corresponding items. The total receipts under the new system are higher.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—Compounding is not allowed in respect of tolls at the frontier gates, and to some extent, compounding was allowed even before the Government took over the management of toll-gates.

The REVENUE COMMISSIONER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman).—Formerly, buses and lorries were paying toll at the rate of Rs. 2 at the frontier toll-gates. But under the new rules they do not. As regards bullock-carts, they enjoy exemption except when they carry *nata* fuel, stone, ore, etc. The number of carts passing through such gates and on which toll is levied is also very much less. These account for the low income under the head.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—However, is not the income from tolls very much less now?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—If only we levy toll on all the items on which it was being levied formerly, probably we will get very much more than what we used to get.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—Have the Government appointed supervising officers to see whether toll is being properly levied or not?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The Revenue Inspectors supervise the work.

Mr. K. C. SUBBANNA.—Have they at any time, after checking, passed remarks or submitted reports; and if so, has any action been taken thereon?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes. Departmental action has been taken in a good many cases, and in some others, cases have been handed over to the Police.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The income from the Koppa-Muthur toll-gate has gone down considerably from Rs. 10,130 in 1933-34 to Rs. 4,140 in 1935-36 and to Rs 3,000 after it was taken under Government management. So also the income from the Anechowkur toll-gate. What is the reason for this fall in income?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—When the management vested in contractors, they were levying tolls on many items not allowed by the rules. There were many complaints about this in the Assembly. Subsequent to Government taking over the management, complaints have been few.

Mr. M. SUBBIAH.—Is it a fact that some contractors have offered to pay more than what Government are now realising from some of the toll-gates?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes. But as regards the frontier toll-gates, we cannot accept such offers because we issue licenses for vehicle tax. There is frequent trouble due to contractors ignoring or misunderstanding exemption certificates granted by Government. So we have to manage all frontier gates and other important gates on trunk roads ourselves.

Mr. M. SUBBIAH.—I am referring to the Wellesley Bridge.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.— Even in that case, contractors were not respecting our passes and exemptions; nor were they posting responsible men to be in charge of the gates, and there were lots of complaints about the management.

Mr. SYED KHAJA PEERAN SAHIB.—There is a Government-managed toll-gate on the Tarikere main road and raiyats have a grievance that carts containing fuel, etc., meant for household consumption are not given exemption. Will the Government be pleased to order the exemption being given?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—It is difficult to know whether the fuel carried is meant for home consumption or for sale to the public.

Mr. S. SARABHANNA.—The villagers of Attibele also have a real grievance in this respect.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—The rules are clear, and in all *bona fide* cases exemptions are given. If specific cases

of insistence on payment in contravention of the rules are brought to notice, we shall enquire into them and take needful action.

Improvement of Krishnarajanagara Town.

Q.—11. **Messrs. M. S. BASAVANNA DEVARU** (Yelandur Jahgir); **N. BHOGI MALLAIYA** (Heggaddevankote Taluk); **S. K. SIDDE GOWDA** and **S. THIMME GOWDA** *alias* **THAMMAIYA GOWDA** (Krishnarajapet Taluk); **B. SIDDALINGA SETTY** (Krishnarajanagar Taluk); **K. N. PUTTANNA, SIDDAVEERAPPA** and **GURUBASAPPA** (Chamarajanagar Taluk); **M. MAYI GOWDA** (T.-Narsipur Taluk); **U. L. RAMACHANDRA RAO** (Mysore City Municipality); **G. MALLANNA** (Mysore Taluk); **K. C. SUBBANNA** (Gundlupet Taluk); **S. C. MALLIAH** (Maddur Taluk); **M. SUBBIAH** (Seringapatam Municipality); **B. CHAMAIYA** and **M. SIVANANJE GOWDA** (Seringapatam Taluk); **K. CHIKKALINGIAH** and **J. DEVAIYA** (Mandya Taluk) and **T. MARIYAPPA** (Nagamangala Taluk).

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) what is the amount contributed out of the Krishnarajasagara Special Fund for the improvement of the new town after the old Yedatore Town was submerged;

(*b*) what is the amount spent and for what purposes;

(*c*) what is the unspent balance under each head;

(*d*) has the want of proper drainage, water facilities and good roads in the new town come to the notice of Government?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Mr. R. W. Scaldwell).**—

(*a*) Rs. 3 lakhs.

(*b*) Rs. 3,62,416 (including credits) has been spent so far, for the formation of the new town, shifting of Government buildings and muzrai institutions, water supply, etc.

(*c*) A statement of expenditure under each head is placed on the table (*vide* Appendix). The sanctioned estimate has already been exceeded.

(*d*) Yes.

Mr. B. SIDDALINGA SETTY.—From the figures furnished in the appendix in the answer to (*c*), it is evident that a sum of only Rs. 62,416 has been provided for the improvement of the new town. What improvement can be effected out of this paltry sum?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—We cannot provide more funds.

Mr. B. SIDDALINGA SETTY.—Should not all the facilities which the old town enjoyed be provided now, such as adequate water supply, etc.?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—The new town is 2½ times the size of the old town, and it is difficult to provide all the necessary amenities to the extended town all at once. We have been doing our best, and in certain respects such as roads, etc., the facilities now afforded are better than before. The expenditure of Rs. 3,62,416 incurred on the new town is more than what was required by way of compensation to the old small town. Nothing more can be spent from the K.R.S. capital amount.

Mr. B. SIDDALINGA SETTY.—With regard to water supply, very much remains to be done. The total outlay incurred up-to-date on water supply comes to about Rs. 67,000. But the work actually turned out is not worth even half that amount.

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—The municipality should hereafter bear the cost of any future improvements that may be necessary to meet the needs of the growing town.

Mr. B. SIDDALINGA SETTY.—Why? Formerly the river was very near to the village and there was no difficulty for water at all. For having induced the townsmen to agree to the shifting of the town, the Government ought to give them all the required facilities. The municipality ought not to be saddled with any part of the expenditure on account of such facilities.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—We shall see if anything more can be done to improve the town.

Mr. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Are not the Government deriving a high return from the Irwin Canal scheme?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—Not more than 2 per cent.